

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www wayto gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/516,078	06/30/2005	Hermann Bodinger	4001-1190	8279	
466 YOUNG & TI	7590 11/02/200 HOMPSON	9	EXAM	IINER	
209 Madison S			KOSLOW, CAROL M		
Suite 500 Alexandria, V	A 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1793		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/02/2009	EL ECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/516,078	BODINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C. Melissa Koslow	1793	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi
application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time

periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. a)

The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

The Notice of Appeal was filed on __ . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. 🗵	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
	(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
	(b)⊠ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
	(c) 🔲 They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
	appeal; and/or
	(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE: See Continuation Sheet (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the

non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) X will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:

Claim(s) rejected: 1-6.10-21 and 25-28.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE я

. [☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered
	because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
	was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. Other:

/C. Melissa Koslow/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793 Continuation of 3, NOTE: there is no support in the originally filed disclosure of the newly claimed "a" range.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendment was not entered and the arguments with respect to the 35 USC 112 rejections are not convincing. The teaching of x+y+z+1 does not define the upper limits of x and y. The arguments with the objections of claims 21 and 27 are noted but do not overcome the object, these claims state that x and y are selected so that the ceramic has a morphotropic tetragonal rhombodifical phase boundary which yields piezoelectric properties, the objection is that all piezoelectric PZT ceramics have this phase boundary that all piezoelectric PC ceramics have this phase boundary does boundary that sets the PZT ceramic piezoelectric. The fact that not all PZT ceramics have this boundary does not overcome the objection since those with the boundary are not piezoelectric.